



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,424	08/13/2001	James Clough	10011005-1	1219

7590 09/11/2007
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BOUTAH, ALINA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/11/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

SEP 11 2007

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/929,424
Filing Date: August 13, 2001
Appellant(s): CLOUGH ET AL.

Patrick R. Scanion
Reg. No. 34,500
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed May 10, 2007 appealing from the Office action
mailed November 28, 2006.

Art Unit: 2143

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US 2002/0103875

Krishnan et al.

08-2002

(9) Grounds of Rejection

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Krishnan et al. (US 2002/0103875).

Krishnan et al. teaches a system/method for accessing network-accessible devices comprising: multiple network-accessible devices, each device comprising:

- a wireless transmitter for wirelessly transmitting associated address data for receipt by individual client devices, the address data being configured for use in accessing, via a network, a network-accessible device that wirelessly transmitted the associated address data; (¶ [0035-0037], figure 1: URL beacon 23 and web address beacon 15)
- a connection module for establishing a network link with one or more client devices based upon the wirelessly transmitted address data, said link permitting individual client devices to access a network-accessible device using the associated address data. (figure 1: 15, 23,24; ¶ [0013], [0034], [0039])
- wherein said link comprises a wireless link. (¶ [0040])

Art Unit: 2143

- wherein said link comprises a wired link. (¶ [0013])
- wherein said link comprises an Internet link. (¶[0021]-[0047])
- wherein said link comprises a wireless Internet link. (¶ [0021]-[0047])
- one or more Internet-connected printers, individual printers comprising: a wireless transmitter for wirelessly transmitting associated address data for receipt by individual client devices, the address data being configured for use in accessing, via the Internet, an Internet-connected printer that wirelessly transmitted the associated address data; and an Internet connection module for establishing an Internet link with one or more client devices based upon the wirelessly transmitted address data, said Internet link permitting individual client devices to access an Internet-connected printer using the associated address data. (¶[0024])
- wherein the wireless transmitter comprises a bluetooth transmitter. (¶ [0039])

(10) Response to Argument

Claims 1-5

Appellant argues that Krishnan et al. fails to disclose a network-accessible device that wirelessly transmits associated address data, which is used to access the device that transmitted the address data. The PTO respectfully submits that this is taught by Krishnan in the cited areas above. Figure 1, as well as paragraphs 0035-0037, for example, discloses an Internet appliance 20, which includes a URL beacon 23. The URL beacon 23 is used to transmit electronically or

“broadcast” to any external receiving device the web address of the web site, which is currently accessed by the Internet appliance 20. The external receiving device can be, for example, the remote operator 10. Other receiving devices may be a PDA, a pager, a watch, a cellular phone, or any kind of information appliance. [see paragraph 0035]. In view of the above teaching, it is clear that the Internet appliance is equivalent to the network-accessible device, and the URL beacon 23 is the associated address data that is wirelessly transmitted to the remote operator 10 (interpreted as a client) as claimed.

In response to Appellant’s argument that there is no disclosure in Krishna et al. that the Internet appliance 10 is accessed by a client device via the Internet or any other network, the PTO respectfully disagrees and submits that this is taught by Krishnan et al. Independent claim 1 specifically recites “a wireless transmitter for wirelessly transmitting associated address data for receipt by individual client devices, the address data being configured for use in accessing, via a *network*, a network-accessible device that wirelessly transmitted the associated address data.” By definition, a “network” is a collection of 2 or more computers and associated devices that are linked together with communication equipment. Paragraph 0033 of Krishna et al. discloses that the Internet appliance 20 and the remote operator 10 can be communicated by employing radio or infrared communications. These types of communications are interpreted as “network” as claimed.

In response to Appellant’s argument that “Krishnan et al. simply fails to disclose a device that wirelessly transmits its own address data to client devices so that the client devices can establish network links with that device,” the PTO respectfully that this feature is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations

Art Unit: 2143

from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In this case, the claim specifically recites a device that wirelessly transmits “*associated address data*,” which is not necessarily its own address. Krishnan et al. teaches transmitting the web address of the web site, which is currently accessed by the Internet appliance 20 to a client. The address in this case is broadly interpreted as “associated address data” as claimed.

Claims 6 and 7

In response to Appellant’s argument that Krishnan et al. does not disclose an internet-connected printer that wirelessly transmits address data used by a client device to establish an internet link with that printer, the PTO respectfully disagrees and submits that this is taught by Krishnan as cited above. Specifically, paragraph 0035 discloses an Internet appliance 20 that wirelessly transmits address data used by a remote operator 10 to establish a link. Paragraph 0024 of Krishnan et al. provides examples of Internet appliance, which includes a printer. It is clear that the teaching of Krishnan et al. anticipates the features of claim 6.

Claims 8-13

Claim 8 recites a network-accessible device, and claim 13 recites an internet-connected printer. Both claims further recite computer-readable media having instructions that cause the processors to transmit the address data using the wireless transmitter and establish an Internet connection based on the wirelessly transmitted address data. Both claims include the elements

Art Unit: 2143

similar to claims 1 and 6, respectively. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 1 and 6 applies equally as well to claims 8 and 13, respectively.

Claims 14-20

In response to Appellant's argument that none of the elements of Krishnan et al. receives a wirelessly transmitted address data associated with an internet-accessible device and uses that address to establish an Internet link with the internet-accessible device, the PTO respectfully disagrees and submits that this is taught by Krishnan et al. Figure 1 illustrates an Internet appliance device 20 that wirelessly transmits URLs to a remote operator 10. Figure 3 illustrates the remote operator that wirelessly receives the URLs from the Internet appliance device 20, storing the URL, and using the stored URL to establish an Internet link [see paragraphs 0044, 0048, and 0052].

Claims 21-70

In response to Appellant's argument that Krishnan et al. does not teach beaconing address data from a particular device and using the address data to establish an Internet link between the device and a client device, the PTO respectfully disagrees and submits that this is taught by Krishnan et al. as cited above. Figure 1 illustrates an Internet appliance device 20 that includes a URL beacon 23 that wirelessly transmits URLs to a remote operator 10. Figure 3 illustrates the remote operator that wirelessly receives the URLs from the URL beacon 24 of the Internet appliance device 20, storing the URL, and using the stored URL to establish an Internet link [see paragraphs 0044, 0048, and 0052].

Claim 28

In response to Appellant's argument that Krishnan et al. fails to disclose wirelessly beaconing associated address data from a network-accessible device or wirelessly receiving such address data with a client device, the PTO respectfully disagrees and submits that this is taught by Krishnan et al. as cited above. Figure 1 illustrates an Internet appliance device 20 that includes a URL beacon 23 that wirelessly transmits URLs to a remote operator.

Claims 29-31

In response to Appellant's argument that Krishnan et al. fails to disclose wirelessly receiving address data that is associated with and transmitted by the same internet-accessible device, and using that address data to establish an internet connection, the PTO respectfully disagrees and submits that this is taught by Krishnan et al. as cited above. Figure 1 illustrates an Internet appliance device 20 that wirelessly transmits URLs to a remote operator 10. Figure 3 illustrates the remote operator that wirelessly receives the URLs from the Internet appliance device 20, storing the URL, and using the stored URL to establish an Internet link [see paragraphs 0044, 0048, and 0052].

Claims 32-35

Claim 32 recites substantially same element of claim 6. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 6 applies equally as well to claim 32.

Art Unit: 2143

Claim 36

Claim 36 recites substantially same element of claim 6. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 6 applies equally as well to claim 36.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix


No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

ANB

ANB


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100


WILLIAM VAUGHN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100